

**MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING**

July 16, 2003  
MAG Office, Saguaro Room  
Phoenix, Arizona

**MEMBERS ATTENDING**

Mayor Neil Giuliano, Tempe, Chair  
Mayor Elaine Scruggs, Glendale, Vice Chair  
Benito Almanza, Bank of America Arizona  
\* F. Rockne Arnett, Citizens Transportation  
Oversight Committee  
Mayor Steven Berman, Gilbert  
Dave Berry, Swift Transportation  
Jed S. Billings, FNF Construction  
\* Councilmember Peggy Bilsten, Phoenix  
Mayor James Cavanaugh, Goodyear  
Councilmember Pat Dennis, Peoria  
Mayor Ron Drake, Avondale

\*Mayor Boyd Dunn, Chandler  
\*Rusty Gant, ADOT  
\*Mayor Keno Hawker, Mesa  
Eneas Kane, DMB Associates  
Mayor Mary Manross, Scottsdale  
Mayor Lon McDermott, Wickenburg  
\*Diane Scherer, Phoenix Association of Realtors  
Vice Mayor Daniel Schweiker, Paradise Valley  
Martin Shultz, Pinnacle West Capital Corp.  
Supervisor Don Stapley, Maricopa County  
Mayor J. Woodfin Thomas, Litchfield Park

\* Not present

#Participated by videoconference or telephone conference call

1. **Call to Order**

The meeting of the Transportation Policy Committee was called to order by Chairman Neil Giuliano at 9:08 a.m.

2. **Pledge of Allegiance**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Chairman Giuliano requested that the audience keep conversations to a minimum during the meeting to ensure that the meeting could be heard. For agenda item #4A revised minutes were at each place. For agenda item #6, copies of letters received on the Regional Transportation Plan were at each place.

Chairman Giuliano announced that transit tickets were available for those who used transit to come to the meeting. Validation was available from MAG staff for those who parked in the parking garage.

3. **Call to the Audience**

Chairman Giuliano stated that an opportunity is available to members of the public to offer public comment. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Andy Dzurinko, former Executive Director of the Governor's Council on Health, Physical Fitness and Sports. Mr. Dzurinko spoke on the importance of health in our lives. He stated that the Centers for Disease Control has officially stated that obesity is epidemic. Bicycle and pedestrian pathways are important. Schools are dropping Physical Education and people are becoming more sedentary. Mr. Dzurinko stated that it is important to have bikeways and pathways to increase physical activity. He stated that the region has an excellent canal system and with a small amount of work they could be expanded to open up miles of paths. For the sales tax, even one percent for these types of projects would be a great start. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Dzurinko for his comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from DD Barker, who stated her agreement with Mr. Dzurinko's comments. She stated that Dr. Art Mollen said that reducing ozone pollution should be a communitywide effort to improve the quality of life. She expressed thanks for the transit tickets. Ms. Barker said "multi-modal, get a leg up." Ms. Barker referred to a letter written to the TPC by Tempe City Councilman Ben Arredondo, encouraging free bus for youth. The letter states that Councilmember Arredondo wants to advance the concept of a regional policy that enables students younger than 18 years ride the bus for free. She noted that some cities already do this to some extent. Ms. Barker stated that the EPA was looking at getting rid of school bus pollution, but these fleets are cost prohibitive for schools. She noted that the City of Phoenix has the largest natural gas bus fleet, probably in the world. Ms. Barker explained that younger students could take the school bus, older students could take the local bus. Chairman Giuliano thanked Ms. Barker for her comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Blue Crowley, who commented on the ozone warning and stated that he saw people arriving for the meeting in their SOVs and SUVs. If you are not a part of the solution, you are a part of the problem. Mr. Crowley stated that there is not conformity for public input within MAG committees and that makes it difficult for the public. Mr. Crowley stated that he was denied extra time when he submitted a card to speak at the TRC meeting. He stated that the minutes were inflammatory because they stated that he went around the table in an attempt to be heard, when it would have been sufficient to say that he had put in a request but was denied. Mr. Crowley commented on agenda item #6, where you have the County as the region. You go urban rather than the multi-county aspect. You are not planning with Pinal County as much as you should. Mr. Crowley stated that he did not see interaction with Yavapai County, except with what Wickenburg does. He needs the TPC to be more creative and work together. He needs the TPC to ask for the money required, which is at least one cent, and do it in the way it needs to be done. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

Chairman Giuliano provided a review of the last meeting, when the hybrid plan and funding policies, such as bus operations and maintenance, and local match for bus operations were discussed. Staff was directed to develop options for local match requirements. While the TPC is to remain cognizant of different priorities among local areas, our job is to provide balanced, regionally-oriented solutions and ensure successful implementation of the plan in its entirety by providing reliable and adequate funding for those included elements. Chairman Giuliano expressed appreciation for staff's work. He stated that outstanding issues with the hybrid plan would be reviewed today. Chairman Giuliano stated that because not all TPC were present, final action would not be taken today.

#### 4. Approval of Consent Agenda

Chairman Giuliano stated that any member of the committee can request that an item be removed from the consent agenda and considered individually.

Chairman Giuliano stated that agenda items #4A, #4B, #4C and #4D were on the consent agenda. He asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Dennis asked the year of the deferment of \$800,000 in closeout funds for the Peoria project. Eric Anderson replied that it was deferred to 2004.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Mr. Crowley, who commented on agenda items #4B and #4C. He stated that when the City of Phoenix receives closeout money for fiber optics for traffic signals, he would like all signals to be uniform, especially in terms of left turn signals. Mr. Crowley stated that studies have shown that lagging lefts are safer. The cost is \$100,000 per intersection per light, an expensive proposition. Diversity is your strength, but the objective is to get the job done. Mr. Crowley noted that in the closeout is rail and Phoenix says it needs 40 percent for its light rail project. He noted that the Phoenix light rail extension is not throughout the region, it is within the city. You need to give the public the options you are discussing. Mr. Crowley suggested bundling capital and operating and maintenance as a three-prong attack. Ask for one cent and divide that into thirds. Let the public know where you are spending the money. Mr. Crowley suggested that with as expensive as light rail and freeways are, why not blend them and use the same right of way? Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

#### 4A. Approval of Revised June 18, 2003 Meeting Minutes

Vice Chair Scruggs moved to approve the revised June 18, 2003 meeting minutes. Mr. Shultz seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

Mayor Thomas moved to recommend approval of consent agenda items #4B, #4C, and #4D. Mr. Shultz seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

#### 4B. Federal Fiscal Year 2003 MAG Federal Funds Final Closeout and Amendment to the FY 2003-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended deferring the City of Peoria, 83rd Avenue at Thunderbird Road project to FY 2004; allocating \$100,000 in FFY 2003 funds for the design of a multi-use underpass in Peoria and \$800,000 for the final design phase of the light rail project as part of the last remaining interim closeout funds; Also, to recommend \$400,000 additional funds for the Maricopa County, Gilbert Road and McDowell Road project as a final closeout contingency project with any remaining final closeout funds going to light rail final design project, and authorizing an Amendment to the FY 2003-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program for the Peoria design project. As part of the FFY 2003 Interim Closeout of the MAG federally funded program, approximately \$13.4 million were recommended for a variety of FFY 2003 projects. Prior to Regional Council action on June 25, 2003, the City of Peoria requested to defer a project that was included in this recommended list of projects for additional funds. The FFY 2003 funds made available by the Peoria deferral total \$890,722. At their meeting on June 26, 2003, the Transportation Review Committee (TRC) recommended that the City of Peoria should receive \$100,000 in CMAQ funds for the design of a multi-

use path underpass and the remaining \$800,000 in FFY 2003 Interim Closeout funds should go to the final design of the light rail project. As part of the recommendation for Final Closeout funds, the TRC recommended two contingency projects: the first \$400,000 in funds that become available should be used for the Maricopa County, Gilbert Road and McDowell Road project and any remaining funds should be used for final design of the light rail project. In order to allow Peoria to utilize funds for its design project, an amendment to the FY 2003-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, as shown in the attached Table, is needed to allow the design to proceed. Since the TRC meeting, the City of Peoria has requested that their 83rd Avenue at Thunderbird Road intersection project be deferred to FY 2004. At its meeting on July 9, 2003, the Management Committee concurred with the TRC recommendation.

4C. Proposed Amendment to the FY 2003-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement for Transit Projects

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended approving an Amendment and Administrative Adjustment to the FY 2003-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program for transit projects. As a result of changes in funding within the annual Federal Transportation Appropriations Bill, Valley Metro has reviewed the Federal Transit Administration Grant application that is under development and wishes to adjust the projects in the Annual Grant and in the TIP to ensure that the two programs are in conformance. As a result, Valley Metro has requested a TIP amendment that adds 11 new projects and deletes two and a TIP amendment is needed to accomplish these changes. In addition, Valley Metro has requested to defer four transit projects and to change the scope of 16 others and a TIP administrative adjustment is needed to accomplish these changes. All of the proposed changes may be categorized as exempt projects or minor project revisions for which an air quality conformity analysis is not required. Consultation on the conformity assessment for the proposed changes is considered under a separate agenda item. At its meeting on July 9, 2003, the Management Committee concurred with the TRC recommendation.

4D. Conformity Consultation

MAG is conducting consultation on a conformity assessment for an amendment and administrative adjustment to the FY 2003-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program. The Regional Public Transportation Authority has requested the amendment to add new transit projects and an administrative adjustment to defer, adjust, and delete existing transit projects. In addition, as part of the Federal FY 2003 Year End Final Closeout, an amendment is proposed to add a City of Peoria multi-use underpass design project on New River Road and to increase funding for the final design phase of the light rail project. This item was on the agenda for consultation.

5. Maintenance Resolution

Tom Remes updated members on the maintenance resolution being developed by the Maintenance Stakeholders Group. The points of the resolution: 1. Dedicate part of the extension of the half-cent sales tax for maintenance of the freeways. 2. Create a dedicated funding stream. 3. Track maintenance expenditures through the Annual Report for the MAG Regional Freeway Program and increase communication with ADOT on the budget process. 4. Partner with ADOT and cities to encourage Adopt-a-Highway sponsors. 5. Develop a long-term litter prevention program.

Mr. Remes advised that ADOT still has comments and requested that the resolution be brought forward at the next TPC meeting.

Vice Chair Scruggs commented that item one in the resolution seemed to state that the only dedicated maintenance funding from the half cent sales tax extension would apply to new freeways only. She asked for clarification if maintenance for the existing freeways would remain as currently funded. Mr. Anderson replied that \$354 million is included in the hybrid plan for freeway maintenance for both existing and new freeways. He added that the wording would be revised to clarify this.

Mayor Manross, a Maintenance Stakeholder member, stated that the resolution pretty closely reflects the work of the Stakeholders Maintenance Group. The issue will take a multifaceted solution. Mayor Manross stated that the most important aspect covered during the Stakeholders meetings was how ADOT budgets are put together. It was helpful to have ADOT and legislative staff who do the work on maintenance operations attend the meetings. Mayor Manross stated that the TPC needs to take this issue seriously, because it is a major concern of all residents.

Mayor Thomas expressed concern that the region must pick up maintenance funding from the half cent sales tax because the Legislature has not acted on the issue. He stated that he remains convinced that the more costs the region picks up, the more expectation there will be because of the Legislature's aversion to taxation. If a tax especially designated for this was passed by the Legislature, the better off we will be.

Mayor Manross stated that Mayor Thomas's concern is partly reflected in the resolution. That is why we will have public meetings on the MAG annual freeway programs so the Legislature will become more aware of the impacts.

Dennis Smith stated there are multiple stakeholders in this. The Group found out that often times the total impact of maintenance need was not even being communicated to the Legislature. Mr. Smith stated that the resolution puts some daylight on the maintenance issues, otherwise, the Legislature gets blamed, but they never had the information communicated to them in the first place.

Mr. Shultz commented that he believed that Mr. Smith was correct. The Legislature is dealing with transportation funding and Highway Users Revenue Funds (HURF) and are in the same dilemma as the TPC—there is more need than money. Mr. Shultz stated that sometimes funds are taken from maintenance for public safety reasons. All levels of government are limited by resources.

Mayor Thomas stated that his point was that all elected officials have the responsibility of taxation. He added that the Governor currently has a Task Force looking at historical impacts of tax dollars diverted from maintenance.

Chairman Giuliano acknowledged the attendance of Senator Marilyn Jarrett, who is a member of the Joint Ad Hoc Committee on the Maricopa County Regional Transportation Plan.

#### 6. Recommendation of Final Draft Stage of Regional Transportation Plan

Chairman Giuliano stated that there were five outstanding segments needing discussion: Funding the I-10 reliever; funding I-17, funding transit; match for transit; and major arterials.

Mr. Anderson noted that at each place were the Southwest Area Transit Study traffic volume maps and a memorandum related to the I-10 reliever. He provided a presentation on the refined version of the draft hybrid scenario.

Chairman Giuliano asked what was funded for the I-10 reliever in the current draft hybrid plan. Mr. Anderson replied that the I-10 reliever was included as an interim six-lane facility without traffic interchanges between Loop 202 and Loop 303, a distance of about 14 miles. Mr. Anderson noted that it would be almost a full freeway without fully controlled access at cross streets.

Chairman Giuliano asked whether the interim facility allowed for land needed for intersections. Mr. Anderson replied that we have sufficient money in the budget for right of way preservation for a full freeway and for traffic interchanges.

Vice Chair Scruggs asked for clarification if the current presentation does not include funding for right of way acquisition from Loop 303 to SR 85, and nothing past SR 85 until 2025? Mr. Anderson replied that was correct. Mr. Smith stated that included the draft hybrid was \$129 million unprogrammed. To protect right of way from Loop 303 to SR 85 is \$53 million, and to build that segment as a two-lane roadway would be an additional \$30 million. Vice Chair Scruggs noted that the unprogrammed amount of \$129 million was assuming a zero match for transit. If the match is higher, that \$129 million would increase.

Mr. Berry suggested eliminating connections and reengineering the South Mountain loop to swing south so it aligns with the I-10 reliever, not bring north to connect at 59th Avenue, but connect at 101 and 303. He asked if this option and the impacts had been examined. Mr. Anderson stated that option had not been examined. In addition, the South Mountain is subject to a complete design concept study and environmental impact statement. Mr. Anderson added that the alignment has not yet been set. Mr. Berry commented that it would be nice to know those impacts. He noted that this was a great design 20 years ago, but does not work now.

Mr. Shultz asked how the match would be apportioned. Mr. Anderson replied that the match would probably be apportioned to where the routes are. Mr. Shultz asked if this would be a changing apportion. Mr. Anderson replied that it would be. Mr. Shultz asked if there was a factor of usage of ridership in the calculation? Mr. Anderson replied that he understood these are net farebox revenues. Mr. Shultz asked if these were linear miles compared to the total. Mr. Anderson replied yes.

Vice Chair Scruggs noted that a major portion of bus operating expense will go to existing routes. If we went from no match to five percent, Glendale, for example, rather than paying 100 percent, would pay only five percent. She referred to the Southwest Area Transit Study maps and asked for clarification that as a full freeway, the I-10 reliever fails in 2030? Mr. Anderson replied that was correct. He noted that it shows fairly high volume between Loop 202 and Loop 303 at more than 300,000 vehicles. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the modeling scenarios are important to help the TPC in making a decision on funding the I-10 reliever. Mr. Anderson explained that the first map shows average freeway daily traffic volumes. Option C was the scenario included in the Southwest Area Transit Study as a facility. He noted that volumes were projected to 2030, which is beyond our window of 2025. Mr. Anderson pointed out the section of the I-10 reliever is projected to carry more than 300,000 vehicles per day. West of Loop 303 to SR 85 the projected volume drops off, though is still fairly significant. Mr. Anderson stated that it also shows the I-10 reliever continuing west past Loop 303 and connecting to I-10 much farther west than what is being discussed today. Mr. Anderson stated that the traffic volumes dropped enough to show that a full freeway facility was not needed west of SR 85. He stated that the TPC is focusing on Loop 202 to SR 85 section for the RTP.

Vice Chair Scruggs asked if the map depicts the segment between Loop 202 and Loop 303 as a full freeway or interim? Mr. Anderson replied that the map indicates a full freeway. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the point is that a full freeway between Loop 202 and Loop 303 is at failure in 2030.

Mayor Thomas commented that the maps showed the I-10 at failure or near failure also, even with the addition of the I-10 reliever. Vice Mayor Schweiker joined the meeting.

Mr. Billings commented that if the I-10 reliever ends at Loop 303 and traffic connects to I-10, adding the projections of 150,000 on the reliever to the 150,000 to 250,000 on I-10 shows failure when both segments are added together.

Mr. Kane asked what is the lane capacity of a full freeway before we get to an unacceptable level of service? He commented that 150,000 to 250,000 is shown as acceptable, but that seems quite congested for that number of lanes. Mr. Anderson replied that the number of vehicles is less capacity than I-10 carries through the Broadway Curve today. He added that volumes would be during rush hour, not continuously. Mr. Anderson stated that the question is do we want to build a facility with level of service C, which is free flowing and costly and serving a small commute time, or build a lesser facility and use monies for other projects. It is a tradeoff. Mr. Kane asked if we did not build the I-10 reliever as a full freeway and we would be transferring vehicle trips, what would be the total on I-10? Mr. Anderson explained that one modeling issue as freeway facilities are added, they tend to attract traffic off arterials. We cannot just take the projections and add them together, we also need to look at the system volume as a whole. Mr. Kane commented if there is not other east/west capacity that is greater or equal to the convenience ratio of the carrier then the carrier continues to attract the drivers and the number goes up. Mr. Anderson replied that was a fair statement.

Chairman Giuliano stated that he would take public comment while in this discussion. Mayor Cavanaugh commented that he was prepared to make a motion on the I-10 reliever after public comment.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Peggy Jones, Chair of the Southwest Transit Assessment Review Team (START), based at the Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce. She thanked Mayor Thomas for his steadfast advocacy of commuter rail. Ms. Jones commented that he has tried to find a common solution to a common problem in their area. She stated that she spent 18 months on the committee working on the MAG High Capacity Transit Study, which cost \$500 million. Ms. Jones noted that the Study recommended commuter rail as a viable option in a couple of years, not in a couple of decades. As a realist, she realizes that there is not a prayer for a citizens group such as START to influence the plan. Ms. Jones stated that she believed if the region has commuter rail today, and not in 20 years, it would be at full capacity. She suggested that a commuter rail line as identified in the original High Capacity Transit Study be included in the plan. Ms. Jones requested that \$5 million be set aside for appropriate studies, a demonstration, an analysis of cost benefits, an MIS, and negotiations with the railroad companies. Ms. Jones stated that it is not inconceivable that funding could come from other sources at later dates. Commuter rail follows the same alignment as I-10 and the I-10 reliever and has the ability to take traffic off the freeways. Chairman Giuliano thanked Ms. Jones for her comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Victor Mendez, ADOT Director. Mr. Mendez addressed the Committee in the absence of the ADOT representative, who was out of town. Mr. Mendez acknowledged the hard work and dedication of the TPC and MAG staff. He commented that ADOT and the State Transportation Board support and recognize the need to develop a multimodal, balanced

transportation plan. Mr. Mendez reemphasized the issues raised in ADOT's letter of June 23, 2003, not all of which ADOT felt had been incorporated into the hybrid plan. Mr. Mendez stated that SR 85 is currently unfunded. To develop the Canamex corridor to the full potential, it needs to be funded as a freeway. SR 74 is underfunded by \$80 to \$90 million and needs to be developed as a four-lane divided roadway. In addition, right of way preservation in this corridor is critical to Phoenix and ADOT objectives. Mr. Mendez stated that I-17 capacity improvements from I-10 to Dunlap, currently funded at \$500 million, is underfunded. ADOT concurs with the City of Phoenix that this is a high priority and \$500 million is an insufficient amount to accomplish improvements. Mr. Mendez stated that the I-10 widening from the Santan traffic interchange (TI) to SR 51 corridor is underfunded by \$300 million minimum. He added that a study is currently underway, and in a few months they will have a better idea of the total cost. Mr. Mendez stated that the amount for County-funded TI's was reduced. He stated that the Black Mountain Parkway should be listed under the freeway TI list. From a city standpoint, this would be beneficial, because there is a 50/50 match as a freeway component, as opposed to a 70/30 match as an arterial component. Mr. Mendez stated that significant dollars are attributed to Grand Avenue. ADOT contends that this corridor does not function as a freeway and fits better in the streets category. Mr. Mendez added that if the improvements are funded with ADOT discretionary money in the future, it would be difficult to make it a high priority from a performance based standpoint. Mr. Mendez stated that ADOT supports all of the arterial and transit components, but would like a better balance. He expressed his thanks to Chairman Giuliano and staff for their work on the plan. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Mendez for his comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Mr. Crowley, who stated that the study area does not include the reservation. He stated that 51st Avenue connects to Maricopa and Riggs Road, but then is shown on the next pages as a reliever. Mr. Crowley stated that when you are not doing the job to start with, how are you going to get the job done? Mr. Crowley referred to the map and stated that he liked HOV lanes, but there are no interchanges included, which is a major part of the system. If you had listened to what he and Mayor Hawker said to do it right in the first place and include HOV lanes as a part. Mr. Crowley expressed his agreement with Ms. Jones' comments. He stated that he would like to see rail to Scottsdale and Fountain Hills and continue the line to meet in northern Arizona so there is a trade route to the Northeast where the majority of the population is. Sending the line to the south and west is not getting the job done. We need to be more of an economic engine when it comes to trade. Mr. Crowley stated that he agreed with ADOT's comments on Canamex. He noted that we are already down one cent in maintenance. Mr. Crowley expressed his thanks to Senator Jarrett for bailing out MAG, because without financing to 2007, you would not have the numbers you do. Mr. Crowley stated that he did not appreciate the division of the money, because you are not getting the job done. He wants there to be three different thirds of a one cent sales tax to be divided into capital and light rail, operations and commuter rail, and streets with a match from the county or cities. Mr. Crowley stated that maintenance costs are \$50,000 per mile for what we have already, so you need to have the costs paid for and done properly. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from David Martin, representing Maricopa 2020, a business coalition. Mr. Martin stated that the coalition will do its best to seek revenue for the campaign and support a May 18, 2004 election. He iterated the coalition's viewpoint on the following issues. They testified at the Legislature last week and indicated they felt that in the current hybrid plan, I-17 corridor was grossly underfunded. ADOT did a study eight years ago that found that two general purpose lanes were needed, one in each direction. The cost would be \$1.3 billion and the hybrid includes \$500 million. Mr. Martin stated that the coalition suggests adding an additional \$500 million at a minimum. He stated that the coalition concurs that the I-10 reliever is currently underfunded by



\$300 million. Mr. Martin stated that the arterial program had \$2 billion, and is now at \$864 million, a cut of \$1.1 billion. In addition, the traffic interchanges' cut from 22 to 12 needs to be readdressed. Mr. Martin stated that a breakdown of regional bus system costs and justification has not been provided. He noted that the amount is \$1.6 billion of RARF. Mr. Martin expressed concern that the proportion is flip-flopped with a great deal of operations on the back end of 20 years. He stated that light rail has expanded and they have not seen the performance measures for the final adopted plan. Mr. Martin stated that the coalition would like the TPC to consider matching funds for regional bus service. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Martin for his comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Jim Huling, Assistant to the City Manager of Mesa. Mr. Huling stated that in Mayor Hawker's absence, he would read comments from a letter from the Mayor dated July 9, 2003, which was at each place. The letter states that the City of Mesa supports regional transit operations and maintenance funding as part of the Regional Transportation Plan. They advocate that 100 percent of the operations and maintenance for regional transit be funded by the region. Mr. Huling continued on that it is imperative that the plan meets the diverse transportation needs of every community within the region, and provide optimal connectivity between communities. In order to accomplish this, the fact that local communities have different priorities and provide a balanced palette of regionally-oriented solutions must be acknowledged. Additionally, they advocate for the creation of firewalls to preserve the integrity of each mode of transportation in the plan. Transit services and street improvements are integral to the success of the Regional Transportation plan as it relates to Mesa residents as well as its East Valley neighbors. On behalf of Mayor Hawker, Mr. Huling stressed the importance of the Williams Gateway Parkway freeway currently in the hybrid plan. He added that this represents the only new freeway in the East Valley and will serve an area that is projected to have more than 100,000 jobs and be one of four mega-job centers in the region. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Huling for presenting Mayor Hawker's comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Jack Tevlin, Phoenix Deputy City Manager. Mr. Tevlin stated that the City of Phoenix has been working with MAG staff to address the issue of limited resources in this program. He mentioned that at the beginning of the process, Phoenix commented on receiving its fair share of the sales tax revenue. Looking at the hybrid plan, the City recognizes that its projects would take Phoenix beyond its fair share. Mr. Tevlin stated that the Mayor and City Council believe that with I-17 being their strongest freeway need, the funding should be increased by \$500 million. The City recommends this be accomplished by removing the east/west portion of the Southwest (South Mountain) loop in Phoenix, which is a \$600 million freeway facility. Mr. Tevlin stated that the City's request is that the east/west portion of the Southwest loop be removed from the map, freeing up \$600 million and placing \$500 million of that on the I-17 corridor from Dunlap south to the stack and the additional \$100 million be put toward the full cost of new interchanges on existing freeways throughout the region. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Tevlin for his comments.

Mayor Manross asked Mr. Tevlin about the process the Council used to arrive at its decision. Mr. Tevlin explained that the Southwest loop was included in the 1985 plan, but never funded. In addition, they were never able to reach consensus on the eastern portion of the loop. Mr. Tevlin added that there is a divided roadway on Pecos Road that was the original designation of the east/west portion. He noted that the community of Ahwatukee has stated its opposition to this alignment, as well as the councilmember representing that area. Mr. Tevlin added that the Gila River Indian Community might be interested in three locations on the reservation for that east/west portion. He stated that the City recommends the north/south leg be built to handle traffic in Laveen and Estrella areas over 20 years. In addition, the east/west portion remains unfunded and \$600 million in the plan be transferred to I-17 where the concept would be to build a deck with four lanes from Dunlap to the stack and the \$100

million left might be used to fund new interchanges on existing freeways at the 100 percent level, not requiring a local 50/50 split.

Chairman Giuliano noted that this seemed to fit with ADOT and Maricopa 2020 comments. Mr. Martin commented that it seemed counterintuitive to drop the southwest portion, because it addresses the I-17 problem, but creates another one. He added that Maricopa 2020 would give thought to this option.

Mayor Manross asked about the traffic implications. Mr. Anderson replied that data is available, but that option has not been modeled.

Dennis Smith asked for clarification as to whether Phoenix wanted to leave the alignment on the map and try to fund with other sources, or take the alignment off the map? Mr. Tevlin replied that the City would not object to a connection if the Gila River Indian Community can agree to the location, but if the alignment has to appear on Pecos Road, they would prefer to have it removed so there is no confusion among Ahwatukee residents, who object to the Pecos alignment.

Chairman Giuliano asked if this represents the desire of the people in the area. Mr. Tevlin replied that official committees have indicated to the City Council that they oppose the Pecos Road alignment.

Mr. Anderson stated that previous discussion took place that an additional \$500 million was needed for I-17. The thinking was to try to go after federal money for I-17. The Phoenix position was to have adequate funding for the most congested corridor and try to get federal money for the South Mountain segment. Mr. Tevlin noted that if I-17 received \$1 billion and the South Mountain received \$600 million, the City would be beyond its fair share.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Ken Driggs, RPTA Executive Director, who read a letter dated July 10, 2003 from Mayor Manross, Chair of the Valley Metro/RPTA.

“The Valley Metro/RPTA Board of Directors unanimously approved a motion to include operations and maintenance (O & M) expenses for transit without a local match requirement as a component of the RTP. The rationale behind the approval follows: Many communities in the region do not possess the local resources needed to match regional O & M expenses and to require a local match would have the effect of limiting the ability to develop and operate a truly integrated regional transit system. Local match requirements have the effect of developing a regional transit system that is subject to, and dependent upon, local jurisdictions annual budget process and appropriations of funding the local match. If one community decided that its funds would serve a better purpose elsewhere, or experienced a budget shortfall as exists today in some of our communities, it could single-handedly eliminate the local match funding of a regional transit route, affecting citizens in neighboring communities and throughout the region. If a local match were required for transit O & M expenses, what would likely be created is a fragmented regional transit system characterized by jurisdictions with transit service, and those without. This actually decreases personal regional mobility and may have the effect of requiring jurisdictions without local match to bring additional tax measures to its citizens for approval to receive regional funding that its citizens already pay. Regional transit systems throughout the U.S. are financed via voter approved regional sales taxes for a defined duration and voters are periodically asked to reaffirm their commitment to continued funding for the transit system. In short, it is our belief that funding regional transit operations and maintenance expenses without a local match requirement is an integral part of any new RTP.”

Mr. Driggs mentioned that Jim Dickey would provide numbers on ascending costs of transit in his presentation. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Driggs for his comments.

Mr. Shultz stated that he would like to pursue the match issue from a policy standpoint. He stated that from his standpoint, past discussions on limited resources have been very professional and regional. He thanked Chairman Giuliano for his leadership. Mr. Shultz stated that most projects based on performance based standards will make it into the hybrid, but there is the matter of limited resources. Those advocating no match, he was trying to understand from a policy standpoint, when we have capital requirements, don't local governments put money into capital? Mr. Tevlin replied that most buses are paid with an 80 percent federal contribution and 20 percent local contribution. With the bus expansion, the federal ability to match has been exceeded, so Phoenix pays for some vehicles with local money. Mr. Tevlin stated that with light rail, there is a 50/50 federal/local match, with no federal funding of operations. That is 100 percent local funding. Mary O'Connor, Tempe Deputy Public Works Director, explained that Tempe has federal funding sources for bus capital, not for operations. She stated that bus and rail are funded solely at the expense of the communities where the services go. Ms. O'Connor stated that when the Tempe tax was passed in 1996, the City wanted a route on Priest. Tempe pays the Guadalupe costs because it does not have the funds, and there are no federal funding sources for operating the route. Mr. Huling stated that Mesa's buses are paid with an 80 percent minimum match.

Mr. Shultz stated that he recognized the sensitivities to local governments' budgets. At the federal level, with regard to transit and light rail capital investments, there is some match and the local government must come up with its match. He expressed concern by the no match option even though he did not know what the match percent might be. Mr. Shultz stated that the current practice depends on circumstance, but emphasizes some local match. He stated that he would like to have discussion of some sort of match for appropriate reasons.

Mr. Tevlin commented that if a principle is adhered to, such as the one where the federal government requires a match for transit, then does that mean the TPC should establish a match for highways as well? He noted that the City of Phoenix puts into transit approximately \$160 from its general fund each year. Mr. Tevlin added that it is difficult for the City to understand why it should be required to put in even more due to the heavy contribution it is already making.

Mayor Thomas stated that when Tempe decided the Priest route was necessary for its own community needs, that is where he looks at a local match being required. Ms. O'Connor stated that Tempe did provide funding for other communities when it started their system, but had to cut that money during difficult budget times. That illustrates the point that you cannot have regional connectivity when you have local jurisdictions funding other local jurisdictions' service. Ms. O'Connor added that it is important to note when the match rate changes, the percentage for transit decreases.

Mayor Manross stated that Scottsdale presently supports all of its local routes. The City has a two-tenths of one cent tax dedicated to transportation. Due to the economy, Scottsdale has had to cut back and use the sales tax money for funding other projects. Mayor Manross stated that currently, the region does not have a sufficient transit system. The 80/20 federal match will continue for Scottsdale's transit system. However, if we continue to require a local match, we will continue to have the same problems and will not have a regionally connected system. Mayor Manross stated that Scottsdale will continue to fund its local system, but will want to connect with surrounding communities. Mayor Drake joined the meeting.

Mayor Berman stated that the process has been painful because all feel the need to represent their own community. Discussion took place earlier that each community had some projects they would have to have. Mayor Berman stated that no match is something the Southeast Valley has to have to make it work for them. He urged that the TPC consider leaving in no match.

Mr. Berry asked if the match or no match applied only to additions to the system from the half cent sales tax extension or to existing money already being spent on the existing system? Mr. Smith stated that depends on the geographic areas of the valley. If in the Southeast Valley, it would fund principally new service; at the more centralized areas, it could apply to some existing routes. Mr. Berry requested a breakdown of funding for existing systems. Mr. Smith stated that at a previous TPC meeting, a uniform approach was discussed and found not to be workable, because of how transit has developed in the region. Some areas are transit deficient, some have light rail, and so on. Mr. Berry stated that it is important for the TPC to know how much money systems cost before voting, no matter where the money comes from.

Vice Chair Scruggs noted that she was not at the Valley Metro/RPTA Board meeting, so she was not part of the unanimous vote mentioned in Mayor Manross's letter. She commented that she understood that supplanting would be taken care of first, and the TPC might want to confirm that number. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that Glendale requested BRT along Grand Avenue, which would be a benefit to all, but that was not included. She stated that some of the statements made in support for no local match actually make the exact opposite position. They said when times are hard, service is cut, and therefore there should be no local match. Vice Chair Scruggs commented that the region would be developing a system that will be built on a funding source that will disappear after 20 years. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that she hoped the TPC would not get down to saying what the percentages would be. By putting in a zero match, the West Valley is down to 28 percent of the total. Adding in the deletion of the South Mountain and Loop 303, which were approved in 1985 but never built, the West Valley is down to 16.4 percent, and this is unacceptable.

Mayor Cavanaugh referred to Mr. Tevlin's comments. He stated that the South Mountain freeway is not a new concept and its regional significance cannot be overstated. Mayor Cavanaugh indicated that it will move traffic that would otherwise go through the central area, and has value for both the East and West Valleys. He acknowledged the I-17 needs substantial funding, but to delete any portion of the South Mountain is the wrong way to obtain funds. Mayor Cavanaugh urged the TPC to not support this, other than a change in alignment.

Councilmember Dennis stated that there should be no local match for transit. The sunset in 20 years is an issue, but it sunset before and can be remedied. Councilmember Dennis stated that the transportation issue will be for our lifetimes. If we look at local match, if her city cannot pick up that percentage, then there is no regional transit for her city. If there is a zero match, that guarantees a transit program for her city. She commented that if they decide to expand their service, then it would be their responsibility to go back to their citizens for local funding. Councilmember Dennis stated that without zero match, there will be no transit for Peoria. She continues to support no match.

Mr. Shultz suggested putting together a chart that starts with a diminimus match and increases over 20 years to a reasonable level. That would be subject to flexibility and may help out with reaching a compromise. Mr. Shultz stated that this might make sense because we will invest in capital and operations will continue to be an issue. He added that the chart must include a farebox test. Mr. Shultz commented that if a diminimus match is used at the starting point, it would not be as impacting, but over time see if service is warranted on a regional basis. Think about this as a policy, so we get to some match for all the right reasons, but not destroy the regional cooperation that has carried the TPC forward.

Chairman Giuliano commented that it may be helpful for staff to discuss the sliding scale match option that might be an incentive for those communities to start up regional bus programs and get support for it. Chairman Giuliano expressed appreciation for Mr. Shultz' suggestion.

Mr. Dickey gave a presentation on the transit program included in the hybrid. He noted that the map of the supergrid incorporated comments received to date.

Mayor Thomas asked if BRT was included in the funding? Mr. Dickey replied that high capacity corridors on the super grid system are funded as BRT at some point in the plan.

Mr. Smith commented that 33 miles of light rail adds \$400 million to make the map work.

Mr. Berry asked if operations are funded out of the extension, how many dollars would go to the existing system, with a breakdown by city. Mr. Dickey replied that the cost for existing systems over a 20 year period would be \$670 million, and \$900 million for improvements and new service. Mr. Berry asked how the numbers were derived. Mr. Dickey replied that the numbers were determined through a Regional Transit Study that was conducted over a number of months. Mr. Berry asked if a breakdown could be provided by city. Mr. Dickey provided a chart that was broken down into the categories of each RPTA member and the others in a group of nonmembers. He reviewed the chart.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the actual cost to each city for operations has not yet been explained. She offered clarification for example, that if there is a 10 percent match, that means a city could provide one mile of service at half hour intervals at a cost of \$6,000 per year. She noted that the RARF investment in Glendale is approximately \$90 million over 20 years, so Glendale would assume the 10 percent match, or \$9 million over 20 years. Vice Chair Scruggs commented that this would not be putting an undue burden on her city. Mr. Dickey commented that this is funding of regional routes, and did not include any other funding for bus operations. Not part of the super grid nor part of express bus or BRT. He added that for some cities, it is a continuing tremendous investment. Mr. Dickey stated that this grid provides connectivity to build local systems.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that Glendale will continue to put millions of dollars into local service. She mentioned that her example was to clarify what a local match equates to.

Chairman Giuliano asked members if there were questions on the chart.

Mr. Almanza asked if the 50 million ridership number was regional to date? Mr. Dickey replied that it was. The number was based on boardings per year, with approximately 150,000-plus boardings per day. Mr. Almanza asked if the future ridership on regional investments was anticipated to maintain or decrease? Mr. Dickey stated that the investment strategy was based on constraint with what is planned in Phoenix and Tempe, with 150,000 boardings per day. The projections of population, employment, and socioeconomic data were figured in, then staff assumed a commensurate level of ridership. He noted that many investments will not happen until the last five years of the program, and it is anticipated that ridership will continue to grow proportionately. Mr. Dickey added that if investments are made too soon, we won't get the ridership we expected; if made later, we should be right on target.

Mr. Almanza stated that he was looking for a gauge to see if we would be making progress because we will be making a large transit investment. Mr. Dickey replied that based on projections, staff expects maintenance and growth in transit usage, as has happened in the past five years. If investments are made at the right time, we would not only maintain, but improve the mode split.

Mayor Manross referred to Vice Chair Scruggs' comments on the cost per mile. She stated it was a valid comment, but in no way argues as to why there should be a match. Mayor Manross stated that Scottsdale wants to be a part of the regional system, but they are at the mercy of neighboring communities because those communities may choose or be forced to cut service, which would destroy

the integrity of a regional system. Mayor Manross stated that she would be fighting for a match if she thought all cities would continue to participate for 20 years. She commented that over the next 20 years, we will continue to improve freeways and streets, but we will be treading water because we cannot build enough to meet the capacity needs. Mayor Manross stated that if transit is not an option, there will not be room for everyone. There is a need to have those choices. Mayor Manross indicated there was no doubt that transit ridership will increase tremendously if the system has integrity and there is not the worry as to whether service might drop off.

Mr. Tevlin referred to Mr. Almanza's comments. After Transit 2000 passed, it took 18 months to receive a new bus. Since the new equipment came in, ridership has increased 10.5 and 11 percent in each of the two years, which is the largest increase of any city in the United States for two years. Mr. Tevlin stated that Tempe had much the same experience when they expanded their fleet. He noted that on Central Avenue, a bus runs every six minutes during rush hour. As a result, buses carry 25 percent of the people traveling on Central during rush hour. In contrast, a bus runs every half hour on Bell Road and carries less than one percent of the travelers. This illustrates that there is a correlation between the frequency, amount, and reliability of service with ridership numbers. Mr. Tevlin stated there is definite statistical experience of double digit increases in ridership when we are able to get the equipment.

Councilmember Dennis expressed concern with the facilitation of transit service routes that might not take place until the last five years of the program. She stated that the Bell Road area has approximately 60,000 to 70,000 people waiting 15 years to get transit service. Councilmember Dennis stated that this area needs relief. It is a major corridor. She stated that she maintains we need a regional system. The numbers are minute compared to the total transportation program.

Mr. Billings stated that the operating budget is \$17 million for 2006 and the number increases to \$114 million in 2025. He asked if it was safe to assume the number increases a multiple of seven annually? Assuming that, in 2045, the number will be \$1 billion per year. When does it even out? Mr. Dickey commented that there would not be the same level of growth from 2025 to 2045. Mr. Billings commented that the number will still be \$114 million in 2025. He asked when it was anticipated that number would decrease. Mr. Dickey replied that the number is not expected to decrease. Mr. Billings commented that the costs will continue to hemorrhage 20 years from now.

Mayor Thomas commented that if you look at the overall savings—11.3 percent of the total—Phoenix is 96.9 percent of that. He stated that Phoenix has the most to gain from this. Mayor Thomas commented on discussion of larger metro areas and how their fares skew the factor. He asked if it was fair to say that rail increases the ratio for farebox? Mr. Dickey replied that for those cities with heavy rail systems, it probably does influence the ratio significantly.

Mr. Kane referred to inflation factors of maintenance costs. The biggest set of variables is not in capital costs for building roads, but in maintenance costs for expansion of the system. Mr. Kane stated this raises two concerns. The plan changes over time as labor costs spike. The sales tax revenue can be sensitive also. He stated that he was unsure how to deal with the operations and maintenance cost curve continuing to rise. How can we present to the voters that mode splits will be reliable after 20 years? What happens to the farebox revenues? Where do the fares go and how does that come back to the cities?

Chairman Giuliano commented that staff would need to do work on this for further discussion. He stated that as the TPC moves forward, it needs to find agreement on match or no match. Whatever individual values might prevail is not the way to devise this plan. Chairman Giuliano encouraged a

blending of values so we have a plan and pull together. As the plan moves forward, it cannot be forwarded with a split vote. Chairman Giuliano stated that discussion is needed on the farebox issue and City of Phoenix comments.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that she would like direction on today's meeting. The TPC has only one meeting left to do their work. She requested clarification on how many TPC members need to be present to make decisions. Chairman Giuliano stated that the TPC would continue their work at the meeting today, and have closure at the July 22nd meeting. He stated that it was agreed that no action would be taken in August because some TPC members would be unable to attend. Today, there are a number of members unable to attend. Legally, the TPC has a quorum, but he felt that was not the way to go without as many TPC as possible in attendance. Chairman Giuliano commented that he felt there would be strong attendance at the July 22nd meeting. He noted that tentative recommendations could be made today.

Mayor Cavanaugh commented that he had no doubt that the TPC would gain by the presence of those TPC members absent from today's meeting. However, the meeting was a scheduled one, we have a quorum, and the TPC needs to move ahead and make decisions. Chairman Giuliano stated that he was hesitant to do that, which does not lend to our process of all coming together. He stated that he felt the TPC should wait until all are present. If decisions do not have to be made today, the TPC would be better off as a body to hold off on final decisions until next week.

The TPC adjourned for a lunch break. Supervisor Stapley left the meeting.

Calling the meeting back to order after the break, Chairman Giuliano stated that staff had worked on options to consider on farebox.

Mr. Anderson explained that if a local match is established for bus service, then performance standards need to be set. A farebox recovery target policy could be established. At the route startup period there would be a zero percent match. Once the route has matured, there would be a percent match still to be determined. He explained that once a route has been established, if the farebox percentage of operations and maintenance is less than the regional target, the match could be ratcheted up. If a route returns a higher percentage, the match might be lowered. Mr. Anderson indicated that staff could look at this in detail. He added that other issues, such as multijurisdictional, could be considered.

Mr. Berry stated that the concept was a good start. We need to define the numbers, but might want a match, even though a route is a high performer. Encourage the TPC to continue on this path. Mr. Berry noted that a definition of firewalls was also needed by the July 22nd meeting.

Mayor Manross commented that the concept accomplishes somewhat of a compromise. She asked the goal of the option. Mr. Anderson replied a goal was to ensure the region is funding higher performing routes. This is also to say that cities could make up the difference of the target farebox on an underperforming route that might be needed to provide subregional service. Mayor Manross questioned if cities choose not to make that decision, are we not back to the same problem of disconnected service?

Vice Chair Scruggs commented that this would be a bureaucratic accounting nightmare. An entire department would be needed for this purpose. She offered an option if the farebox is included and match is set at a percentage, then reduce the jurisdiction's payment of match by farebox recovery. That would still have to be divided out, but perhaps not as difficult to figure out. Mr. Anderson stated that the data would need to be generated regardless because a mechanism would still be needed to appropriate the match across multiple jurisdictions. He explained that this adds a performance measure that says if a

route is not performing to the regional target, then those jurisdictions would have to pay more for it. Mr. Anderson indicated there could be other ways to accomplish this, as Vice Chair Scruggs suggested.

Mr. Shultz commented that this concept could work, and could perhaps be simplified.

Mr. Kane expressed concern that this is an issue where voters could ask if the routes were established to achieve a regional system or are the funds being used to supplant local concerns and budgets. He commented that setting performance standards seems to be consistent with the TPC's task and appropriate for answering voters' questions. Mr. Kane stated that the TPC is trying to spend the money where we get the most bang for the buck with trackable performance standards. What do you do with routes that do not work? If it does not work with a 25 percent farebox recovery after the match, it gets cut.

Mayor Manross stated that in Scottsdale, if a route is unsuccessful, it is cut out. RPTA does a detailed analysis of routes and connections. She added that they work closely with city staffs to meet the needs, and this is not done haphazardly, but with a lot of thought. Mayor Manross commented that with budget problems, she could name specific examples of regionally connected communities that have cut important routes. We cut times of some routes and used our two tenths of a cent tax for other transportation projects. Mayor Manross stated that if we want to have a regional system, there is no other way. Transit needs to be often, safe, clean, comfortable, and reliable. People will respond if they can count on it. They will choose to use it instead of a car. Mayor Manross stated it is good to have a farebox recovery target. Should not have local match because she cannot envision how the region will have a credible connected system. Mayor Drake left the meeting.

Mayor Cavanaugh stated that he would make comments preparatory to his motion. He stated that Mr. Berry offered an option on the connection of the I-10 reliever to the South Mountain, and he agreed. In the future, the eastern terminus should be reconsidered to assist the movement of traffic. Mayor Cavanaugh stated that his motion was a compromise. As late as June, the I-10 reliever was on the map, and today, it is off. Mayor Cavanaugh stated that he understood that Loop 303 to SR 85 connection may not be affordable.

Mayor Cavanaugh moved to purchase full right of way and construct a six-lane freeway from the South Mountain Freeway west to Loop 303 and acquire full right of way for a freeway and construct a two-lane interim road from Loop 303 west to SR 85. Vice Chair Scruggs seconded.

Chairman Giuliano called for discussion of the motion.

Mr. Shultz raised a point of order. He stated that he would like to offer an observation that discussion on substance is extremely important. Phoenix made a motion at the last meeting, and the sense of debate on the motion was to reach consensus that the idea be incorporated into the final plan. Mr. Shultz commented that the sense of the motion be included in the hybrid for the next meeting so the TPC can properly evaluate it. He stated that he was sympathetic to the substance of the motion, but less sympathetic to the process, because he thought the TPC was following an iterative process.

Chairman Giuliano noted that the total to fulfill the motion would be \$411 million. The draft hybrid reviewed today only had \$129 million additional, so the motion would have to indicate the source of the additional revenue.

Mayor Cavanaugh commented that the \$129 million resulted from a zero match, and the TPC had not yet decided that issue.



Vice Mayor Schweiker stated that he was sympathetic to what Mayor Cavanaugh was trying to accomplish, but preferred the process used with the Phoenix motion. He expressed concern for making too many motions at this point because the Chairman has been good on guiding the TPC to reach consensus. Vice Mayor Schweiker stated that he would like to continue in that manner.

Mayor Cavanaugh mentioned that a vote was taken on the light rail issue motion by Phoenix. He stated that he would like to leave the meeting with an agreement that this exists on the map for the next meeting. Then, it could be discussed.

Mayor Manross offered clarification to the Phoenix light rail motion. It was made to ensure that the plan reflected that different modes of transportation, such as BRT and light rail, would be included as part of the plan. She stated that she agreed with Vice Mayor Schweiker about the motion. The TPC has not yet decided the match issue, and the total for a regionally connected system could require an additional \$400 million, and that process has not yet been reconciled.

Councilmember Dennis stated that the TPC needs to move forward and say if they want it on the plan. She added that the reliever is needed. Councilmember Dennis stated that she would like to see the funds taken from the freeway system and not other parts of the plan.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the motion is fair and in keeping with the past. At the last meeting, the TPC was looking at a 15 percent match. Direction was given to staff to prepare different percentage scenarios. What we got back was a map with a zero percent match. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the TPC did not vote nor direct staff to redo the plan, so it is just as fair to put the I-10 reliever in because it will all be sorted out in the end. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that it all gets down to what the match is. She stated she supported the motion.

Mayor Manross stated that the 15 percent number was put out for purpose of discussion. We got back several options from zero percent match to 50 percent match. Mayor Manross stated that staff presented the TPC with all possibilities for decision making. She expressed concern with the motion, because not enough is known about the implications or impacts. What projects will move around or be taken out? She added that there is also the issue of regional transit numbers which have not been fully discussed.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that she said the map had changed to no match because everyone says we have \$129 million on the table, but we have not yet decided the match issue. At the last meeting, we had 15 percent match, and there was \$322 million on the table. In that case, that would leave \$90 million needed to fulfill the motion. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that is a lot different than the map today that was done with a zero percent match. There is an assumption that there is only \$129 million available.

Chairman Giuliano commented that the TPC is aware that no decision has been made on the match. He stated that the TPC asked staff to present options. That is the threshold question, because that determines capacity.

Mayor Manross asked how the match numbers had been done before the latest transit numbers came in and how does the \$400 million affect that? Mr. Smith stated that the scenario staff put together included a 32 percent transit number. The business coalition indicated that could be a planning target they could work around. Mr. Smith stated that the 37 percent transit plan has not yet been discussed with them. What was presented today is \$400 million over what was discussed with the business coalition. There are two issues: Where do you find \$400 million? Even if you find it, will the business coalition agree to a 37 percent transit plan?

Mayor McDermott stated that he would support the motion if it came to a vote. He felt that the I-10 reliever as a full freeway from Loop 303 to Loop 202 should be on the map in any case. Regarding the match issue, we need to get hold of it because funding operations costs for transit is a tradeoff requiring the elimination of badly needed freeways and roads. Mayor McDermott stated that he looked at the maps over the past three meetings, and there are fewer freeways, fewer roads, and more transit. Mayor McDermott stated his agreement with ADOT's position stated in its June 17th response that shows the I-10 reliever as a full freeway from Loop 303 to Loop 202. He stated he agreed with MCDOT on their primary road systems, most of which have disappeared off the maps. Mayor McDermott stated that on July 2nd, transit was 23 percent of the scenario, today it is at 32 percent, and now he is hearing 37 percent. If roads and freeways are not constructed, there will be a heavier demand on transit. Mayor McDermott stated that he remains concerned that transit will not sustain sufficient ridership to warrant that large a percentage.

Mr. Kane stated that significant concerns were raised by ADOT and Maricopa County. He commented that the notion of going forward with the interests being served by those freeways is being shorted. We will get significant blowback from the public, even if it gets past the Legislature. Mr. Kane stated that he was sensitive to consensus building, but thinks the TPC should not make a motion on a footnote. He stated that it is important to vote to see the pleasure of the Committee, so further maps will have those roads on as a priority, with the understanding that on the last day, the TPC will have to find the funds among competing interests. Mr. Kane stated that roads have fallen off and transit has grown. He stated his support for the motion, though not as final action.

Mayor Berman commented that he thought it was a mistake to take a vote without many of the majority interests being in attendance. We need to recognize that there is a finite amount of money that will be raised, and only a portion of that will go west of Central Avenue. If the West Valley sees this as their priority for the plan, that is all right, but there are only so many percents in the pot.

Mr. Billings commented that he thought the TPC was trying to put together a regional plan. He commented that he thinks the TPC would be derelict if I-10 reliever and improvements to I-17 were not included. The TPC must find a way to fund those projects. Mr. Billings stated that the population is moving in that direction. He stated that the equity issue needs to be put aside. The I-10 reliever has to be put on the map, and he thought it should be all the way to SR 85.

Mayor Thomas stated he supported the I-10 reliever. With the Paradise Freeway being cut, this may not be the best location to relieve congestion, but is the only alternative. He mentioned that this morning, three of four lanes of I-10 at 83rd Avenue were blocked by trucks. This is not just a reliever for car traffic, but will create better flow and management for trucks, and will be more efficient for them. Mayor Thomas expressed concern for where Loop 202 comes in. It begins in the East Valley and provides regional mobility. Mayor Thomas noted that a "T" intersection is not desirable and creates more problems. He added that even with the I-10 reliever, I-10 shows there will be still be congestion. Mayor Thomas stated that in a regional plan, we have to have that connectivity. This is not just a West Valley issue, but a traffic management issue. He stated that the traffic coming through includes freight that goes to all parts of the region.

Mayor Cavanaugh commented that the I-10 reliever would be part of the West Valley's 27 percent of the total of the half cent sales tax extension. He stated that he made the motion to impact the plan, and understood it was a tentative action. Some of the TPC requested this be discussed at the next meeting. Mayor Cavanaugh stated that he would like a vote and if it passes, he would like it reflected on the map.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that Mayor Cavanaugh said it very well that the action was for tentative recommendation, not final action. She stated that projects west of Central come in at 22 percent of the total. A large part of that total is from the South Mountain and Loop 303, which were approved in 1985 but never done. If you take those two projects off, the total is now 16.4 percent, and the population west of Central is much higher than 16.4 percent. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the West Valley is not attempting a large grab of the funds, but is reflective of the population share.

Chairman Giuliano stated that the TPC has reached consensus in the past to direct staff, but not a tentative approval of a piece of the overall plan. He stated that he would oppose action to tentatively approve any piece of the plan, but supports having a plan created from the desire of a member to see what their piece might mean in the plan overall.

Mayor Cavanaugh stated that he wanted there to be a change to the final plan. There is only one hybrid left and this needs to be on that map.

Chairman Giuliano asked staff about the process for adding the project in without deleting something or adding it in and dealing with it later. Mr. Anderson stated that those were the two choices, and staff would need direction. The project could be added in and would unbalance the plan. Mr. Anderson stated that direction could include options such as the Phoenix proposal on the South Mountain.

Mayor Cavanaugh stated that he wanted it on the map, whether balanced or unbalanced.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the current map has the transit operations match at zero percent. This was never voted on, just developed. The TPC had requested options be developed for comparison. Mr. Anderson stated that at one of the TPC meetings, staff was given direction to see a plan with a zero percent local match, and actually was directed to do zero to 20 percent matches—staff merely landed on 15 percent.

Mr. Smith stated that the TPC could give direction on balancing with other components, or just put it in as unbalanced and discuss at the next meeting.

Mr. Shultz commented that being overprogrammed is symbolic of our problem. He stated that Mayor Cavanaugh presented documentation of capacity requirements, and that deserves serious consideration. Performance standards have been vetted. Why not embrace for the final plan the things we considered and have an unbalanced plan, with the understanding that at the next meeting, we create a balanced plan. We will need to take something off or change the resource requirements. Mr. Shultz stated that the TPC needs to capture for the citizens these important projects and accommodate them as best we can with limited resources.

Chairman Giuliano stated that he would be happy to support that intent if after taking action the TPC can give direction to staff to come up with a listing of projects within the plan that might be able to drop out of the plan so we are not at square one.

Mr. Shultz added that would also include a menu of options on resources.

Mr. Almanza stated his agreement with Chairman Giuliano. Include the I-10 reliever on the map and have other options so the TPC can prioritize.

Mayor Cavanaugh, as maker of the motion, agreed. Vice Chair Scruggs, as second, agreed.

Vice Mayor Schweiker commented that the projects should be ranked according to performance based criteria.

Chairman Giuliano stated that the motion would be to include the I-10 reliever, as Mayor Cavanaugh stated, and staff would show options on how to deal with overprogramming.

Mayor Manross asked the options that could be considered. Mr. Smith stated that some projects could be put in as illustrative projects, or discretionary or federally funded. He brought up that ADOT mentioned that \$500 million is insufficient for the collector/distributor system. It gets to a point of triage—need to say which projects will not live, and then take that money and redistribute it.

Mr. Anderson stated that one resource area to investigate is an increase in the gas tax. Another area to consider is to implement more than a one half cent sales tax.

Chairman Giuliano stated that these might be recommendations at the end of the process, but not connected to the TPC's efforts. Mr. Smith commented that another option could be a 25-year tax.

Vice Chair Scruggs commented that the TPC initially discussed this option, but the decision was made to proceed with a 20-year tax.

Mayor Manross agreed that other revenue sources should be proposed, but not mix that in with this process.

Vice Mayor Schweiker concurred with Mayor Manross that this should be recommended in the future. He recalled that he originally felt, from a business point of view, that the appropriate amount should be raised to make improvements, but the Legislature did not go with that option.

Mr. Billings commented that it was his understanding that everything is on the table, not just freeway projects. The money could come out of any part of the regional program.

Mr. Smith stated that the I-10 reliever, I-10 improvements, and the light rail line together total \$1.5 billion. The I-17 improvements with the Phoenix recommendation would be a little more than \$1 billion. The I-10 improvements to Tempe through the Broadway Curve are \$500 million. These are big chunks of the total \$15.5 billion. The goal is to make the plan respectable. We can come up with projects to cut and can show volumes, if desired. Mr. Smith noted that the TPC voted on geographic equity as plan criteria.

Mayor Berman stated he could support the motion if there was a breakdown of projects by east, central and west, showing dollars and percentages. Clearly, some projects will have to be taken off, and this will make it easier to be fair.

Mr. Smith stated that regional equity is easier said than done. The collector/distributor system is a good example because those roads run throughout the region. The difficulty is how do you allocate that cost? The I-10 reliever is another example because it brings freight into the entire region.

Chairman Giuliano stated that it gets down to the definition of what is being done for the region. We have a general idea of where the projects are but some projects seem to be in one part more than another, but really serve the region. Staff will have the information Mayor Berman requested without identifying it as such.

Mr. Anderson stated that the attempt was made to identify each project for the region. Criticism could lead to discussion on not what the plan should be, but what the percentage should be. He cautioned that this discussion would not be productive.

Vice Chair Scruggs asked the cost per mile for light rail. Mr. Smith replied the assumed cost is \$60 million per mile.

Chairman Giuliano called for a vote on the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Shultz requested that staff be directed to describe the tests that will be needed on the plan, such as air quality, capacity, and performance standards so the TPC will know what the work product will be.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

---

Chairman

---

Secretary